IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

In re:)	
AMERICAN METROCOMM CORPORATION, et al.,) Bankruptcy No. 00-3358 (P	JW)
	Debtors,)	
THOMAS ABRAMS,)	
V.	Appellant,)) Civil Action No. 04-1372 (J	IJF)
AMC LIQUIDATING TRUST,)	
	Appellee.	<i>)</i>	

SHORT RESPONSE TO APPELLEE REPLY BRIEF, and: (1) MOTION TO CURE RECORD DUE TO 'EXCUSABLE NEGLECT'; (2) MOTION TO FILE DESIGNATION OF RECORD OUT OF TIME

Appellant Thomas Abrams, appearing in proper person, herein files the above motions and a short response to the Appellee reply brief, as follows:

Although a citizen's right to appeal¹ is as elemental as it is sacrament, appellee ignorantly continues to argue this court lacks jurisdiction. In fact, <u>denial</u> of this appeal would be an *abuse of judicial discretion* absent a showing by the District Court of appellant's "flagrant bad faith" or "willful failure" to file his appeal notice, or "evidence of an intent to flout the District Court's instructions;"

AUG - 8 2005

U.S. DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

¹U.S. Const. amend. XIV.

or "deliberate dilatory action," or "callous disregard" by the present *pro se* appellant of his responsibilities to follow federal court procedures.²

Therefore, appellant respectfully motions for a judicial determination of "excusable neglect" as a matter of law and/or equity. This trial court has broad discretion in determining what constitutes "excusable neglect" under Rule 4(a) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, and such a determination is accorded great deference on appellate review and will not be reversed in the absence of an abuse of discretion.³

With respect to extending the time to file a notice of appeal based on excusable neglect, a trial judge also has wide discretion in dealing with a litigant whose predicament results from (as appellee alleges) blatant ignorance of clear or easily ascertainable rules. In the instant appeal, Judge Walsh allowed the Claimant to proceed in forma pauperis and allowed the Claimant to appeal his Order granting summary judgment. If Judge Walsh had not wanted to allow appellant IFP status or to file his appeal out of time – if the court had decided Abrams' "neglect" was not excusable – he would have denied IFP and late-filing status and

²See, for example, <u>Poulis v. State Farm Fire & Casualty Co.</u>, 747 F. 2d 863; 714 F.2d 124 (3d Cir.1983); <u>National Hockey League v. Metropolitan Hockey Club, Inc.</u>, 427 U.S. 639,96 S.Ct. 2278, 49L.Ed.2d747 (1976); <u>Titus v. Mercedes Benz of North America</u>, 695F.2d746 (3 Cir.1982). ³See, for example, <u>Harris Truck Lines, Inc. v Cherry Meat Packers, Inc.</u> (1962) 371 US 215, 9 L Ed 2d 261, 83 S Ct 283; <u>United States v Ferrer</u> (1980, CA1 Puerto Rico) 613 F2d 1188.

Record + bading Enclosed 04-



| The control of the